

*2. Pub. L. 106-457—Secondary Treatment Facility in Mexico*

Operation of IWTP as an advanced primary facility would continue with 25 mgd of primary treated effluent sent to a Secondary Treatment Facility to be constructed in Mexico. Treated effluent would be discharged through the SBOO. Facilities in the U.S. would include: a pump station located on the SBIWTP site; a force main extending from the pump station across the international border to the site of the Secondary Treatment Facility in Mexico; and, a return flow pipeline from the treatment facility to connect with the SBOO.

*3. Operate the IWTP with Treated Flows Returned to Mexico for Discharge to Pacific Ocean at Punta Bandera*

Operation of IWTP as an advanced primary facility would continue with conveyance of the treated effluent to Mexico via primary effluent return connection (PERC) conveyance/pumping facilities at the SBIWTP and existing conveyance/pumping facilities in Tijuana. If effluent does not enter the San Antonio de los Buenos WWTP, it would be discharged to the surf at a point approximately 5 miles south of the U.S. border at Punta Bandera.

*4. Operate the IWTP With Treated Flows Returned to Mexico for Discharge to Pacific Ocean South of Punta Bandera*

IWTP would continue to be used for advanced primary treatment with discharge of treated effluent to the Pacific Ocean at a point approximately one mile south of Punta Bandera (approximately 6 miles south of U.S. border).

*5. Operate IWTP With City of San Diego Connection*

Operation of IWTP as an advanced primary facility would continue but with a total of 15 mgd of advanced primary treated effluent sent to the City of San Diego's Southbay Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP) for secondary treatment via a new connection with discharge of treated effluent through SBOO. The IWTP would send 10 mgd of screened effluent to the City's Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant for secondary treatment via the City's South Metro Interceptor.

*6. Operate the IWTP With Treated Flows To send to Mexico and SBWRP*

This alternative would be the same as Alternative 5 but instead of sending 10 mgd of screened effluent to Point Loma WWTP, 10 mgd of primary treated effluent would be returned to Mexico for discharge to the Pacific Ocean at Punta Bandera.

*7. Completely Mixed Aeration (CMA) Ponds (i.e., Secondary Treatment) at the IWTP*

As evaluated in the 1999 FEIS and ROD, a CMA pond system would be constructed at the IWTP to provide secondary treatment.

*8. IWTP Closure/Shutdown*

The IWTP would be closed as a result of lawsuit resulting from SBIWTP's noncompliance with Clean Water Act. Mexico's current pumping, conveyance, and treatment facilities would be used to handle projected sewage flows.

**Availability of the Draft SEIS**

The USIBWC anticipates the Draft SEIS will be made available to the public by August 2004.

Dated: October 14, 2003.

**Mario Lewis,**  
*Legal Advisor.*

[FR Doc. 03-26620 Filed 10-21-03; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7010-01-P**

**FEDERAL MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION**

**Sunshine Act, Meetings**

October 15, 2003.

**TIME AND DATE:** 10 a.m., Thursday, October 23, 2003.

**PLACE:** Hearing Room, 9th Floor, 601 New Jersey Avenue, NW., Washington, DC

**STATUS:** Open.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:** The Commission will consider and act upon the following in open session:

*Secretary of Labor v. Rag Shoshone Coal Corporation*, Docket No. WEST 99-342-R, WEST 99-384-R and WEST 2000-349. (Issues include whether the judge correctly concluded that the Secretary of Labor's interpretation of 30 CFR 70.207(e)(7) was reasonable; whether the judge correctly concluded that the Secretary of Labor was not required to engage in notice-and-comment rulemaking before imposing the 060 designed occupation for purposes of sampling levels of respirable cost dust; and whether the judge correctly concluded that the Secretary of Labor's imposition of the 060 designated occupation was not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion.)

The Commission heard oral argument in this matter on October 9, 2003.

Any person attending this meeting who requires special accessibility features and/or auxiliary aids, such as sign language interpreters, must inform

the Commission in advance of those needs. Subject to 29 CFR 2706.150(a)(3) and § 2706.160(d).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jean Ellen (202) 434-9950/(202) 708-9300 for TDD Relay/1-800-877-9339 for toll free.

**Jean H. Ellen,**

*Chief Docket Clerk.*

[FR Doc. 03-26778 Filed 10-20-03; 1:19 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6735-01-M**

**MORRIS K. UDALL SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY FOUNDATION**

**Notice of Federal Advisory Committee Meeting**

**AGENCY:** U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, Morris K. Udall Foundation.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The National Environmental Conflict Resolution (ECR) Advisory Committee, of the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, will conduct a public meeting on Wednesday and Thursday, November 12-13, 2003, at the Westward Look Resort, 245 Ina Road, Tucson, Arizona 85704. The meeting will occur from 8 a.m. to approximately 5 p.m. on November 12, and from 8 a.m. to approximately noon on November 13.

Members of the public may attend the meeting in person. Seating is limited and is available on a first-come, first-served basis. During this meeting, the Committee will discuss: Committee organizational details; environmental conflict resolution (ECR) processes in connection with Section 101 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); best practices in ECR; reports of subcommittees on NEPA Section 101, best practices, and affected communities; and planning for future Committee work.

Members of the public may make oral comments at the meeting or submit written comments. In general, each individual or group making an oral presentation will be limited to five minutes, and total oral comment time will be limited to one-half hour each day. Written comments may be submitted by mail or by e-mail to [gargus@ecr.gov](mailto:gargus@ecr.gov). Written comments received in the Institute office far enough in advance of a meeting may be provided to the Committee prior to the meeting; comments received too near the meeting date to allow for distribution will normally be provided